

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RATANA HAMILTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:21-cv-01337-SAB

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO  
SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS  
SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR  
FAILURE TO FILE OPENING BRIEF

(ECF No. 16)

**FIVE DAY DEADLINE**

On September 7, 2021, Plaintiff Ratana Hamilton filed this action seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying an application for disability benefits pursuant to the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1.) On August 16, 2022, the Court granted an unopposed motion extending the time to file an opening brief until September 15, 2022. (ECF No. 16.) No opening brief has been filed and the deadline to do so has expired.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **within five (5) days of entry of**  
2 **this order**, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why Plaintiff should not be sanctioned for  
3 failing to timely submit an opening brief in this matter, and may concurrently submit a request or  
4 a stipulation for a *nunc pro tunc* extension of time.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: September 20, 2022

7   
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE